

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS LE'ROY HENNAGAN, JR.,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-04-1900 JAM DAD P

vs.

K. PROSPER, Warden, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

_____/

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On October 6, 2008, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Petitioner has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. The findings and recommendations filed October 6, 2008, are adopted in full;

3 and

4 2. Petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

5 DATED: January 8, 2009

6
7 /s/ John A. Mendez
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

/henn1900.805hc